```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                  WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
 2
                       FORT SMITH DIVISION
 3
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                              PLAINTIFF
 4
                          CASE NO. 2:20-CR-20015
   V.
 5
   JASON D'JUAN GARFIELD
                                              DEFENDANT
 6
 7
 8
                        SENTENCING HEARING
 9
                          MAY 26, 2021
10
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE P.K. HOLMES, III
11
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
                      FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS
13
14
                    APPEARANCES
15
   FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
  MR. AARON LANCE JENNEN
   United States Attorney's Office
   35 East Mountain, #516
   Fort Smith, Arkansas 72701
18
   (479) 521-6170
   aaron.jennen@usdoj.gov
19
   FOR THE DEFENDANT:
20
   MR. JAMES B. PIERCE
   Office of the Federal Public Defender
   Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building
  30 South 6th Street, Room 205
   Fort Smith, Arkansas 72901
23
  (479) 782-1097
   james pierce@fd.org
24
25
```

Paula Barden, RPR, RMR, Federal Official Court Reporter 35 East Mountain Street, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701 THE COURT: We're here this morning for a sentencing matter in the United States versus Jason D'Juan Garfield, Case Number 2:20-CR-20015-001.

The defendant is present with his attorney,
Mr. James Pierce. The government is represented by
Assistant United States Attorney Aaron Jennen.

Parties ready to proceed?

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Jennen, you can take your mask off.

MR. JENNEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll just tell the folks in the courtroom, there's going to be a new order entered today, a new administrative order by Judge Hickey, who is the Chief Judge, regarding the wearing of masks. And basically just to briefly summarize that particular order, it's going to say that individuals who have been vaccinated do not have to wear a mask in the courthouse. Social distancing, though, is still going to be required.

And then secondly, if a person has not been vaccinated or chooses not to answer the question whether or not they have been vaccinated will have to wear a mask.

And that's the policy that we will have.

So, Mr. Pierce, I'll allow Mr. Garfield to take

his mask off because he will need to testify as well.

Again, the government is ready to proceed?

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defendant ready to proceed?

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm first going to state the procedural history of this case.

Mr. Garfield was originally arrested on a criminal complaint. The parties entered into a plea agreement by which Mr. Garfield would waive indictment and plead to an information. However, the Court was unable to set a waiver of indictment/change of plea hearing before the Grand Jury convened, so the government presented the case to the Grand Jury which returned an indictment on the same counts in the information. In other words, the information and the indictment are identical.

Is that correct, Mr. Jennen?

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Now, on August the 5th of 2020, Mr. Garfield appeared with Mr. Pierce before this Court. At that time, he waived the right to be charged by an indictment and consented to the filing of an information charging him with one count of possession of a machine gun, one count of possession of an unregistered silencer, and one count of possession by a prohibited person. The

information also included a forfeiture allegation.

Mr. Garfield pled guilty to the information pursuant to the terms of a written plea agreement.

Now, Mr. Garfield, I need to just ask you a couple of questions. The first one I'm going to ask you, have you been satisfied with the counsel, the representation, and the advice that you have received from your attorney, Mr. Pierce?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. A presentence investigation report was prepared in this matter on September the 23rd of 2020, and a final report was filed on October 13 of 2020.

Mr. Garfield, did you have an opportunity to review and to read this presentence investigation report and discuss it with your lawyer, Mr. Pierce?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. And Mr. Pierce and Mr. Jennen, have you both reviewed the presentence investigation report including any revisions that may have been made to that report after the initial disclosure?

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. And the defendant had no objections and the government had no objections to the original presentence investigation report, so the Court

will adopt the final presentence investigation report as filed.

Now, at this time, I'm going to set forth what the sentencing options are in the case. These are the statutory penalties that apply to the counts in the information.

There are three separate counts, as I mentioned. The statutory penalties applicable on Count One are the maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years, a term of supervised release of not more than three years, a maximum fine of \$250,000 and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Now, the statutory maximum penalties on Count Two of the information include a term of imprisonment, maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years, a term of supervised release of not more than three years, a maximum fine of \$10,000, and a special assessment of \$100.

For Count Three of the information, the maximum term of imprisonment is 10 years, a term of supervised release of not more than three years, a maximum fine of \$250,000, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Essentially, the statutory maximums are the same for Counts 1 and 3 and for Count -- excuse me -- 1 and 3, and then Count 2 is differently. Mainly the maximum fine is the difference between those regarding the statutory

penalties.

Now, the United States Sentencing Guidelines are advisory. I've consulted those guidelines in determining the sentence to impose, but recognize that I have the authority to depart or vary from that recommendation in the sentencing guidelines.

At this time, I'm going to do a guideline calculation. I'm going to follow the presentence report and go through my own guideline calculation. Under 3D1.2(d), Counts 1, 2 and 3 are grouped for guideline purposes. In other words, they are considered together. Under 2K2.1, the base offense level is a level 20. Because the defendant possessed 13 firearms, the offense level is increased by four levels.

Now, the probation office in the presentence investigation report awarded the defendant a two-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility. I've read the presentence investigation report and I've concluded, after reading it, that this defendant has not accepted responsibility for his criminal conduct, so I'm not going to give the defendant a two-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility, nor does the government need to move for an additional downward -- for an additional motion for additional points since I'm not going to award the two-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

I base that not only on the offense conduct, but also looking at paragraph 98 of the presentence investigation report. The defendant entered a plea of guilty in the case on advice of counsel. Defendant acknowledged the conduct, expressed agreement with the factual basis presented to the Court at the time of the change of plea.

And basically I disagree with the probation officer. She said just the fact that he pled guilty, that was sufficient for him to accept responsibility. I don't see anything, particularly in this offense conduct, or any other statement that would entitle him to a two-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility. Therefore, it's the Court's view that the offense level is a level 24.

Criminal history category, he has one criminal history point, which places him in Category I, so the guidelines recommend the following sentence:

A term of imprisonment of 51 to 63 months, a term of supervised release of one to three years, a fine in the range of 20,000 to 200,000, and then a mandatory special assessment of \$300. That's \$100 on each count.

So now in calculating and determining the sentence that the Court is to impose, the Court is going to base it on the factors found in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). That is, the nature and the circumstances

of the offense. The defendant's history and characteristics. The sentencing range under the guidelines of 51 to 63 months. And the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants who have similar records and have been found guilty of similar conduct.

Now, the Court is considering an upward variance in the case based on the offense conduct. And so at this time, I'll ask Mr. Jennen if he has any comments regarding what sentence the Court should impose.

MR. JENNEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as outlined in the government's sentencing memorandum, the government has asked this Court to apply a seven-level upward departure. And as the Court knows, the basis for that is two-fold. First, the government believes there are aggravating circumstances of a kind and to a degree not adequately taken into consideration by the sentencing guidelines.

And two, the government believes the offense conduct was calculated to influence or affect the conduct of the government by intimidation or coercion, or to retaliate against government conduct.

As is very clear from the offense conduct section of the PSR, there is substantial aggravating factors not accounted for in the sentencing guidelines. First, the firearms he has been convicted of possessing were obtained

for his repeated stated purpose of committing acts of violence against religious, racial and ethnic minorities, and as well as to carry out mass casualty attacks. I'm not going to reiterate the facts in support of the government's argument here, Your Honor, as I think they are sufficiently outlined and I know the government has reviewed the sentencing memorandum.

THE COURT: The probation officer, this particular probation officer always does a very good job.

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And she has done the best job of laying out the offense conduct, some of the best I've seen. And it's laid out extensively very well. And the Court understands it and has read it many times.

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor. And the facts in the presentence report the government relied upon are summarized in pages 3 through 4 of its sentencing memorandum.

Number two, Your Honor, the facts in the PSR also show that the defendant sought to influence a high school student to ascribe to his ideals of white supremacy, as well as to participate in acts of violence and terrorism against racial, ethnic, and religious minorities.

Three, the defendant made clear his wish to recruit other individuals to join him in a perceived

imminent race war with a preference for young adults aged 18 to 20 years old.

Your Honor, these aggravating factors highlighted by the government now and in its sentencing memorandum as well as contained in the presentence investigation report are not accounted for in the guidelines, and pursuant to 5K2.0 warrant, we believe, a seven-level upward departure.

THE COURT: Let me -- I don't have the sentencing memorandum in your book here. Could you tell me what -- we don't have a sentencing memorandum on the docket.

Did you file a sentencing memorandum?

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, it's filed under seal.

(pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jennen.

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the government also contends in addition to Subsection 5K2.0 that the seven-level upward departure is also warranted based upon application note 4 to Section 3A1.4, the terrorism enhancements guideline.

The note, application note 4 to that guideline states that, "An upward departure is warranted when the offense of conviction is not a federal crime of terrorism" -- which the defendant has not been convicted of -- "but the conduct was calculated to influence or affect the conduct of

government by intimidation or coercion or to retaliate against government conduct."

As the Court is well aware from the offense conduct in the PSR, the defendant repeatedly stated that his purpose for obtaining and stockpiling weapons and manufacturing machine guns was in preparation for what he believed to be an imminent race war. He discussed overtaking an Air Force base. The defendant expressed his desires to replicate the Oklahoma City bombing carried out by Timothy McVeigh of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The defendant discussed carrying out attacks on ATF headquarters in Washington, D.C. The defendant talked about his willingness to assassinate the Governor of Virginia for prohibiting firearms on public grounds. The defendant also discussed his interest in carrying out an attack of a black Arkansas State Senator.

His fiance, as related in the presentence investigation report, Ms. Kaytlyn Tippett, explained to law enforcement that the defendant idolized Adolf Hitler and Brenton Tarrant, the Christchurch New Zealand mosque shooter, because -- and the quote is, to quote her -- "The United States government was not doing anything about people coming in and trying to take over the country."

The government argues that the facts contained in the presentence investigation report show that the

defendant's offense conduct was calculated to influence or affect the conduct of government by intimidation or coercion or to retaliate against the government conduct.

And for that reason, the Court should apply the requested seven-level upward departure.

All that said, the Court should apply a seven-level upward departure with the resulting guideline range of, it was 78 to 97 months, but with the additional three levels because the Court did not award acceptance of responsibility, the resulting guideline range, Your Honor, would be 108 to 135 months.

The defendant argues in his sentencing memorandum that the Court should not apply an upward departure of any kind because the defendant is, quote, "young, has very little criminal history, and has never been incarcerated before." The government agrees that those things are mitigating facts. However, the aggravating factors in the government's opinion greatly outweigh the mitigating evidence present in this case.

The government would also point out that in preparation for this sentencing hearing, the defendant discussed his history and offense conduct with Dr. Sam Wallace, which is found in the exhibit to the sentencing memorandum at Document 43-2. During that, the defendant stated that he became radicalized on "4 Chan" and, quote,

"The information he obtained confirmed his personal beliefs." That's at page 9.

The defendant stated that he only cares about his, quote, "own people." Again at page 9. Dr. Wallace related that the defendant, quote, "Described his anger at a small group of people exerting power over others and noted that Jews own the news media and the banks." Again at page 9. The defendant told Dr. Wallace that he did not like black people and said that, quote, "They act like retards." And they are, quote, "All the same," adding, as the Doctor described with a frustrated tone, "Have you ever been around them?"

Even after being convicted of firearms offenses, the defendant maintains that he should be able to possess weapons because, quote, "The world is going to expletive, and that he shouldn't just lay there and take it." That's at page 9 as well, Your Honor. The defendant said there was, quote, "Nothing wrong with his idolization of Brenton Tarrant," the Christchurch New Zealand mosque shooter. That's at Page 10. The defendant defended his belief in accelerationism and stated that he was not willing to, quote, "Sit there and expletive take it." That's at page 10 as well.

Your Honor, the government would note that all of these statements were made after he had pled guilty and

knowing that this Court would soon be pronouncing sentence and that the purpose of that interview was for sentencing evidence.

Most disturbing to the government is

Dr. Wallace's statement that, "Contrary to the defendant's claims that his repeated statements regarding his desire to commit violent acts against minorities were" -- in his words -- "dark humor," that Mr. Wallace determined, quote, "He cannot ascertain the validity of his report that his commentary regarding violence against various groups of people were fiction and for entertainment versus genuine threat." That's scary, Your Honor.

Based upon all that and based upon all the evidence before the Court at this time, and in light of the 3553(a) factors, the government would argue that the Court should apply a seven-level upward departure and sentence the defendant to a guideline sentence in the resulting guideline range. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Jennen. Mr. Pierce?

MR. PIERCE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, in preparing for today, I've been thinking a lot about working with Mr. Garfield. He has been in custody since March of last year, over 14 months. And I have come to know Mr. Garfield in a way that's a little unusual simply because of the amount of time that we

spent, but also because he's very young. And I've seen him change, and I've seen his attitude change during the period of time that I've been working with him. And I think that the Court should seriously listen to what he has to say when I'm done today. I know in advance --

THE COURT: Of course, what you're telling me now is based on interviews you have had with him. There is nothing in the record that expresses -- I'll give him the right to allocute here in a moment after you have your time. But, I mean, this is some of the most reprehensible, horrific conduct I've seen since I've been on the bench. And then when he says he was just -- anybody who believes that just -- is just -- I was just joking. It's just astounding that that would be the response that he would have in an interview about this. I can't really -- I mean, I'm going to refer to that part of the PSR because I meant to mention that a minute ago when I denied his acceptance of responsibility.

"Only a fool would take them as serious." Only a fool. He may think I'm a fool here. I don't care what he thinks of me. But I'm reading this. This is the some of the most horrific, reprehensible conduct I've seen. He's lucky that the statutory maximum is 10 years. It's the Court's view that the statutory maximum penalties on some of these offenses, firearms offenses is just too low. But

Congress gets to decide that, not me. So go ahead.

MR. PIERCE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as I was saying, I've gotten to know Mr. Garfield, and I have seen a change in him during the 14 months that I've gotten to know him. And I want the Court to think about that. I understand the conduct is very reprehensible. It is what it is. It's black and white. We can see it. We have gone over it. It's one of the longest presentence reports I've ever seen for a gentleman in a criminal history Category I.

What I found incredible here is the idea that this young man, who was 21 years old when this activity started, is still young and his mind is not fully formed or developed. We know that, Your Honor. It's almost -- I think the Court can even take judicial notice of the insurance industry says that young males have a high insurance risk until they're 25 years old. There's a reason for that, because their minds are not fully formed. We see that all the time in drug cases.

THE COURT: You know, I don't take that as an excuse. This United States Capitol was full of 20-year-olds, and they are breaking down, violating the law. Someone who is that age ought to know the difference between right and wrong, ought to know what's a violation of the law and what's not a violation of the law.

The real mitigating factor for him, he had -- the offense conduct is horrific. He had a pretty horrific background growing up.

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that may have formed some of his views on life. It's awful. It's unfortunate some children who grow up in that type of atmosphere don't have a chance, and it's not because of their own making. But they reach an age at some point in time they have to make a choice in life of what they are going to do.

MR. PIERCE: And I understand that, Your Honor.

Let me move to, shift to that. When he described his growing up and his childhood as horrific is an understatement. And I have heard with many defendants, many of my clients describe their childhoods. I've never heard of anyone like this one before. That is horrific. And what do we expect will happen to someone who is brought up in those consequences? What do we expect their attitudes and their perceptions to become when, at six years old, he's shown pornography. Before he's eight years old, he's already been sexually violated by a man who they tell him that's his father, and it's not.

His stepfather was a black man. His stepfather's name is on his birth certificate, is my understanding. The biological father was gone. And mama was using any ability

for any stability that she could have, even with the gentleman who turned out to be her pimp. There were drugs in the home. She was a prostitute. That's all in the report, Your Honor. And that's starting at four years old, five years old, six, eight.

Then at some point, the stepfather is out of the picture, and another gentleman, Mr. Carr comes in. And this is all covered in the sentencing memorandum and Dr. Wallace's report, as well as the presentence report. And he thought, well, maybe Mr. Carr will be better to me. They played video games and got along. But over time, Mr. Carr physically assaulted him. Mr. Carr sexually assaulted him.

You know, Your Honor, the government is real concerned about influenced young people. Where was their concern when he was six years old? When he was eight years old? When he was 14, 16, 18, where was the government then? Mama finally gets to the point she can no longer contain Mr. Garfield, so she has a protective order issued against him. And that's all covered in the report. And he finally gets old enough and big enough where he's like, I've had it. And he's living on the streets. He's living with friends, even with teachers or anyone who will put him up for a while. Yet he still graduated high school.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do we really think, are we naive enough to think, that growing up in that kind of situation is going to lead to a normal thinking or judgmental process? It's not. I consider myself so lucky. I had two loving parents. grew up with them. They gave me some degree of individualization. And I'm so thankful I had that. That's something he'll never have. He'll never even be given the chance to go back to something like that. And yet we scratch our heads and think, how did he end up being so radicalized?

I think Dr. Wallace really hits the nail with the 12 hammer when he says, he needs counseling, he needs treatment, he may need pharmacological intervention. But the one thing Dr. Wallace told me when I reviewed the report with him in anticipation of a hearing today, he said, the one thing I can tell you, Mr. Pierce, is Mr. Garfield is still capable of meaningful change. capable of meaningful change. What makes that statement so critical here is that Mr. Garfield really has nowhere else to go. He's pretty much hit rock bottom. He's lost his family. He's lost his rights. He's losing his liberty. What else can we do for him? Do we just punish him for his ideas? Yes, those were ideas. They were bad ideas. But you know what? So was the other people involved in those conversations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Mr. Garfield was 21 when he got involved with some of these conversations. That's when it was discovered, but it goes back before then. Whatever happened to James Wisdom? Nothing. Why not? He had violent rhetoric. He was goading back and forth. Nothing ever happened with him. What about Mr. Pelts? Now, Mr. Pelts was sentenced before this Court for buying him a firearm back in February. But wasn't Mr. Pelts the one who created the "Right Wing Death Squad" chat page on Facebook? Wasn't it him? That's what it says. That's what he told people. And yet Mr. Pelts, he gets 24 months of probation.

Now, I understand that's a different crime. understand that. But the rhetoric is still the same. Why are we going to punish him --

THE COURT: I tell you on Pelts, I went through and analyzed all those Facebook messages about who was making the statements and who was responding and so forth. I gave careful consideration to that, as much as I have to this case too.

MR. PIERCE: And I appreciate that, Your Honor.

But there are other individuals who have never 22 been charged with anything. And I'm not saying they should or shouldn't be. That's the government's job. They get to pick and choose who they want to go after and who they want to leave alone. I understand that. But he's a target.

He's a huge target with a target on his back. It just seems -- it just seems incredible to me that as reprehensible as the behavior is, that society has gotten to the point that we are just going to warehouse him away and just take away his freedoms for protection of the public for something that came across as an idea, not as a deed.

Now, the deeds? Okay, he had -- he made machine guns. The deeds, he had a silencer. The deeds, he had guns he shouldn't have had. He understands all those things. He understands he's got to be punished for all those things. But at what point do we draw the line and say, this punishment is sufficient, but not greater than necessary. And that's where I'm having a hard problem here, Judge. I understand -- you know, Judge, I don't envy you, because this is going to be a hard case, to me. Maybe it's not. Maybe I'm being naive.

THE COURT: No, it's a very difficult one. In fact, these are some of the cases I could easily have done by videoconferencing, but after reading the PSR in this case, I decided that this needed to be an in-court sentencing hearing.

MR. PIERCE: And I appreciate that, Your Honor.

I think that body language helps us understand a lot, not just the words. I mean, you can't see much when you only

see this much. You can't get much out of the communication.

Your Honor, I could go on, but let me just summarize it this way. Mr. Garfield is now, he's now 23. That's all. He's just 23 years old. This conduct happened when he was 19, 20, 21. But since 21, he's been in custody. His 22nd birthday was in custody over this behavior. And I submit to the Court that his description to Dr. Wallace was really more of a historical note, not so much as, "This is how I still feel." I'll let him tell you what he feels. But when Dr. Wallace -- and I find it incredible that the government is going to use the statements that my client gives to his doctor to try to get treatment, to try to understand why does he think the way he thinks, against him as an enhancement for sentence. That's going to chill anyone who wants treatment. They are just going to say, "I'm just going to say nothing."

I submit that that's more historical data than how he currently feels. I'll let him tell you for himself what he feels. I mean, I'm not going to jump in his shoes. I want him to explain that for you, Your Honor. But I think any upward variance is unneeded. I think I have that the range -- I originally thought --

THE COURT: Frankly, I'm appalled at the sentencing range for what the offense conduct is. I mean,

I knew when I read this, I knew I was going to do an upward variance. I mean, the offense conduct is not -- you just cannot explain it away. I mean, here is somebody who knew he could not possess a firearm, and other individuals acquired firearms for him. Not only did he just acquire firearms, he made them fully automatic, made them machine guns, had a silencer.

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean, these firearms offenses are some of the worst I've seen. I mean, you take somebody who is convicted of a felony that goes out there and has a 9 millimeter just because they are going to use it to protect their drug trade is far different from someone who has these ideas about race wars and so forth and converts AR-15s into fully automatic weapons and talks about training out in the field, and talks about doing a "McVeigh" at the courthouse in Little Rock.

I don't know what drove this young man into this thinking. There's no question that his background set him up for this. But I tell you another view I had. He's probably a fully intelligent individual.

MR. PIERCE: I believe that, Judge.

THE COURT: I don't think this guy is dumb at all. I think he's probably highly intelligent, and he knew what he was doing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, I agree with --THE COURT: This is one of these more difficult cases where the -- I've got some of them tomorrow too. They're just difficult when the Court has responsibility of figuring out under 3553(a) where to lay the sentence. It's not easy to do.

MR. PIERCE: Well, Your Honor, although I may disagree with the Court by denying Mr. Garfield acceptance of responsibility, I would submit that that is enough of an upward departure for Mr. Garfield, because his range is now 51 to 63 months. That's over four years to over five years, for a person who has never had a felony before. He's had a misdemeanor, but he's never had a felony before.

His prohibited person conduct was the mental illness that he had with the altercation with this mother who we discussed ad nauseum. So, Your Honor, I submit to the Court that an upward variance of seven levels is just overly punitive. It's not needed. And where he needs to be is in a diagnostic or a medical unit that can address his needs. Again, Dr. Wallace said he is still capable of meaningful change. He's still 23.

When he's released, Judge -- because he will be 23 released at some point -- he's going to be on supervision. There are going to be rules for that. We can monitor his progress once he's released. And if there's any problems

at all --

THE COURT: That's really one thing that astounds me about the statute is the statutory maximum supervised release is three years. I put people on supervised release for five and 10 years all the time because it's necessary to protect the public from further crimes. This is just three years.

MR. PIERCE: But that's still three years, Your Honor. Your Honor, even at the low end, he's going to be in his 30s before he's released off of everything. Before he makes his term of incarceration, before he meets his --finishes his term of supervision, he's going to be in his 30s. What kind of person are we going to make him into from here? That's all that I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Pierce. You did a good job. Your job is to be an advocate and you do it well.

MR. PIERCE: Well, thank you.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Garfield, you can remain seated there, but I'm going to give you an opportunity to speak. You've heard a lot going on here today. I want you to take the time to say whatever you wish to say in your allocution.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I'd like to start by simply

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

acknowledging that I was in the wrong. I know there's been some back and forth over whether I really accepted responsibility over it. But I'd like to say that group think is a real thing, and that being away from the groups I was a part of for the last 14, going on 15 months, it has -- that time to reflect, I can really see where it's -it was definitely bad, as you said, heinous. Sorry. I'm going to just write --

THE COURT: That's okay. I want you to --Mr. Garfield, I want you to take your time. I know you've written some things up. But just relax, because I want to hear from you. Also, that microphone, don't get too close to it, but anyway, I want to make sure I can understand you.

THE DEFENDANT: All right. I know that as it 16 stands right now, my mark on the world was -- well, for lack of a better word, it's bad. What I said and thought was downright disgusting at times. You've seen the conversations between several people in my group chats. And I've disappointed everyone so far. Lost, as it stands, I've lost almost everything, some of my closest friends from third and fourth grade and up. Lost a job and all my transportation. Lost my congregation at church. The type of people that I'm not going to get back.

I didn't really -- I had just found my family

about a little over a year before my arrest. Well, a year and a half. We are products of our environments. A lot of the beliefs that I've had, issues I still have, I mean, lived in a hostile environment in a constant state of paranoia, 23 years. So some of those memories are --

Now, after all this, whatever the Court decides to do with me, when I come out of it, I'm going to have a criminal record. That is not going to go away. I don't see myself getting a pardon for that, ever. It's going to make my life harder finding employment. I know it's easier these days than it was 20 years ago for a felon, but I think the nature of my case is going to cause a hindrance.

I'm scared of becoming like my biological father that as you know spent several years in federal prisons.

Never met the man. Talked to him on the phone a few times.

And I don't know what happened with him.

My second stepfather and most of his friends spent years in prison, and I've seen firsthand what doing long periods of time incarcerated did to them. They couldn't hold down jobs, couldn't really function. Second stepfather ended up sexually assaulting me. And part of it was, in one conversation we had, it was over -- it led me to believe that being in prison caused him to do that. But it wasn't his first time.

I'm locked in my cell for 23 hours a day, have an

hour out to take a shower, call my family when I can. So most of my day is spent thinking. Thinking that if I had made -- if I had made an effort to get away from everything, to try and better myself, to take responsibility, be a better person for my family and myself, that this could be a totally different situation right now. I could have been married already, hold my first child, not having to worry about what they are going to go through as they grow up. Knowing that I can steer them away from the direction that I've been in. That -- sorry.

All I've ever wanted in life is a family that will love me for who I am. And I've let them down, disappointed them greatly. I have to try and come back from that. And I'm worried if I will be able to after all this is said and done. If I will be able to be a productive member of society and take care of myself and do what's right. And hopefully be able to help people that are in my shoes, help steer them in the right direction, keep them from making these choices, because it's -- there is a point of no return on it, as we see throughout history. And I am sort of thankful that I am here now, that things couldn't escalate and I reach that point of no return, that I am able to step back and see it and have a better understanding.

Your Honor, I just hope I have the opportunity to do what's right, make things right before it's too late. That's all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make one comment, then I need to ask Mr. Jennen a question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You just confirmed to me that you're a bright, intelligent individual. I don't know if you wrote that yourself or your lawyer helped you or whatever, but it's very well written. You expressed yourself very well. In fact, you've expressed yourself much better than most defendants that come here to the courtroom. Most of them come in here and say, "I'm sorry for taking the Court's time," or some answer like that. But you're a bright individual. And I'm going to impose sentence here momentarily, and I don't know if you are going to be able to rehabilitate yourself or not. Prison is not the easiest place to be rehabilitated. But, I mean, courts have to impose sentence that shows respect for the law, that shows just punishment for the offense that occurred, so I'm going to go through those in a moment. But anyway, I appreciate your comments.

What I need to clear up, Mr. Jennen, did you move for upward departure, or are you just moving for upward variance?

MR. JENNEN: An upward departure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So there's a motion pending and I need to rule on that motion?

MR. JENNEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's clear. My law clerk picked that out for me. So often, the way the guidelines work and the way sentencing works under the 3553(a) factors, we so often deal with these issues with variances as opposed to departures. But a departure is, under the guidelines, an option for either party to move for a departure based on the guideline calculation.

But in any event, I need to rule on that motion for the record. I'm going to deny the motion for an upward departure. And as I mentioned, I am considering an upward variance based on the 3553(a) factors.

So having ruled on that motion, again, the guideline range that I calculated is 51 to 63 months. And the guideline range is one of the factors that the Court takes into account in imposing the sentence.

Let me discuss the 3553(a) factors. And I'm not going to discuss them in much greater detail because I've already actually mentioned them quite a bit during the discourse here between the counsel and the Court regarding the sentence the Court would impose. But anyway, let me just kind of briefly go back and discuss those again.

He's got three firearms convictions. And he's an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

individual who normally could not possess these firearms based on a court order entered by Johnson County Circuit Court. And even knowing he could not do that, he possessed an arsenal of firearms that included fully automatic weapons, silencers, and other firearms, along with ammunition. And while it was illegal for him to possess those, when you look at the firearms that he possessed and you read the rhetoric that was captured from the seizure of the Facebook records of the text messages and other conversations, and also the information that was obtained through the Title III wiretap, he had the ability to cause some horrific crimes. He really did. And that's what makes this case so serious, because even though it was just a conviction for possession of firearms, when you take that with the rhetoric that he engaged in, it was the recipe for some serious, serious, horrific offenses.

Again, in 2019, that's when the FBI opened up this investigation and obtained these Facebook chat messages that had a lot of this information. One thing I notice in going back through there, I don't know what the period of time was for the subpoena of records, but when he was interviewed, he said anybody -- a fool would think -- I can't remember exactly how he said that. I was just kind of astounded by that comment he made, "who does not think I'm joking is just a real fool."

But nevertheless, these comments went on for a long period of time. These weren't offhand comments that were just made. They went on for a long period of time, and that's of great concern to the Court as well. Also, there was the discussion about setting off bombs like the Oklahoma City bombing. Through his employment, he had access to anhydrous ammonia, which could have been used to manufacture a bomb. In fact, he discussed in some of these chats about how to make bombs.

But in any event, the offense conduct in this presentence report is laid out so well and gives the Court so much information, I could discuss the nature and circumstances for the rest of the day, which I'm not going to do. But anyway, I do think that the nature and circumstances of the offense dictate an upward variance.

The defendant's history and characteristics. While the probation office does do a good job, of course the information they put in the presentence report is based on what he tells them. I think that his description, his allocution here about his background and how he grew up shows what a horrific background he had. And I think -- I don't know that there's any question that the problems he has today are a result of this background. He wasn't just exposed intermittently to some problems. Apparently, this was a difficult childhood throughout his entire childhood.

And the Court just hates to see this happen. And it happens in a lot of cases and a lot of these defendants who come to court have difficult childhoods. I think he's probably had one of the more difficult childhoods I've seen of any of the defendants that have been here.

I'd also say that the report that was prepared by Pinnacle, I'm hopeful that Dr. Wallace's diagnosis and comments regarding this particular defendant are accurate, because if they are accurate, he does have some opportunity or chance at rehabilitation. And also the Court believes that Mr. Garfield is a very intelligent individual, so I think he possesses the ability to be able to do something about his return to society.

Again, the Court needs to impose a sentence that shows seriousness of the offense and provides just punishment, the need to protect the public from further crimes. All those are taken into account in determining the sentence. The need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities. The government made reference to the terrorist guidelines and so forth. We're fortunate this case never crossed that bright-line, but I think those to some extent -- I'm not going to say necessarily overstate, but doesn't accurately describe I think what the offense conduct is here. I think that the presentence report does a very good job of that.

So here's what I am going to do. I gave this case a lot of thought before the sentencing hearing about where this sentence would land. And after hearing everybody, hearing the government, hearing the defendant, it's going to land right where I thought it would land before I entered the courtroom. But I wanted to hear from everyone before, make sure that it kind of confirms. But here's what I'm going to do.

I'm going to do upward variance. I'm going to impose a term of imprisonment of 78 months. I think that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the goals of sentencing. That will be 78 months on Count One, Count Two, and Count Three. And they will run concurrently.

The Court will impose a term of three years on each count, three years of supervised release on each count. They are to run concurrently. And that term of supervised release will contain two special conditions.

Number one, the defendant shall submit to inpatient or outpatient mental health testing, evaluation, counseling and/or treatment as deemed necessary and directed by the United States Probation Office.

Number two, the defendant shall submit to a search of his person, real and/or personal property, residence, place of business or employment and/or vehicles

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

conducted by the United States Probation Office based upon a reasonable suspicion of criminal activity or any violation of a condition of supervised release. The Court finds the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine, therefore, no fine will be imposed. The Court will impose a special assessment of \$300, which is mandatory and due immediately. I also have here a final order of forfeiture that forfeits the firearms. I've signed the final order of forfeiture, which will be entered. Mr. Pierce, do you know of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as stated? MR. PIERCE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Do you, Mr. Jennen? MR. JENNEN: No, Your Honor. Just one thing regarding the final order of forfeiture. 16 After the preliminary order was entered, the government realized that one of the firearms in the 18 19

preliminary order -- that would be the Brownell -- there is a statement on this in the final order. That was actually the property of the government, and therefore, we are dismissing the forfeiture as to that firearm.

THE COURT: Okay. I didn't fully understand you. What now?

MR. JENNEN: The Brownell Model BRN-4 5.56

caliber M-16 firearm, the Court had entered a preliminary order of forfeiture as to that firearm. However, after entry of the preliminary order, the government realized that that firearm actually was the property of the government. It had been used in an undercover operation and was not the property of the defendant, therefore -
THE COURT: Has it been deleted from this final order?

MR. JENNEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. JENNEN: There is a statement in the final order dismissing the forfeiture as to that firearm. But nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Then the sentence is imposed as stated.

Mr. Garfield, you have a right to appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow involuntary or there was some other fundamental defect not waived by your guilty plea. You also have a statutory right to appeal the sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you think it's contrary to law.

Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. If requested, the clerk will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf. If you cannot afford to pay the cost of appeal, you have the right

```
to apply to appeal in forma pauperis, which means you can
 1
 2
   ask the Court to waive the filing fee, and under appeal,
 3
   you can apply for court-appointed counsel.
             Mr. Jennen, now that the Court has imposed
 4
 5
   sentence, are you going to move for dismissal of the
 6
   indictment?
 7
             MR. JENNEN: We so move, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: The indictment will be dismissed.
 9
             Anything further from the government?
10
             MR. JENNEN: No, Your Honor.
11
             THE COURT: Anything further from the defendant?
12
             MR. PIERCE: No, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: The defendant will be remanded to the
   custody of the United States Marshals and the Court will be
14
15
   in recess.
             (proceedings concluded)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Paula K. Barden, CCR, RPR, RMR, Federal
Official Court Reporter, in and for the United States
District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, do
hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28,
United States Code that the foregoing is a true and
correct transcript of the stenographically reported
proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the
transcript page format is in conformance with the
regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United
States.

Dated this 11th day of June 2021.



PAULA K. BARDEN, CCR, RPR, RMR #700
Federal Official Court Reporter
Western District of Arkansas